



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,235	08/26/2003	William B. McClure	1924/US/2	6207

20686 7590 02/28/2006

DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
370 SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 4700
DENVER, CO 80202-5647

EXAMINER

PYO, MONICA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/649,235		MCCLURE, WILLIAM B.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Monica M. Pyo		2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 present for examination.
2. Claims 1-16 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. No information disclosure statement (IDS) was filed for consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,427,032 issued to Irons et al. (hereafter Irons).

Claim 1:

Regarding Claim 1, Irons discloses a method for managing form-based records comprising (see Abstract):

- generating a unique identifier (Irons: col. 7, lns. 13-33; figs. 1, 3 & 3a – Irons discloses a “label” which corresponds to “a unique identifier”)
- printing a form including the unique identifier (Irons: col. 8, lns. 50-60; col. 29, lns. 35-45; fig. 14 – fig. 14 illustrates a form 1450 printed with text and a label 1451 on a document)
- scanning the form to capture information including the unique identifier (Irons: col. 7, lns. 52-61; col. 8, lns. 65-67; col. 9, lns. 1-6; figs. 1-2)

Art Unit: 2161

- storing the information as a record in a database (Irons: col. 8, lns. 1-15; col. 9, lns. 6-18; fig. 2); and
- indexing the record by the unique identifier (Irons: col. 8, lns. 30-54; fig. 1) .

Claim 8:

Regarding Claim 8, Irons discloses an apparatus for managing form-based records, comprising:

- an input device (Irons: col. 7, lns. 52-62; col. 8, lns. 10-15; col. 10, lns. 40-60; figs. 1 & 2);
- a web browser operatively connected to the input device (Irons: col. 11, lns. 16-23 & 38-44; fig. 2);
- a database searchable by the web browser and storing at least one form-based record (Irons: col. 11, lns. 60-67; col. 12, lns. 1-12);
- a display device operatively connected to the web browser and database, the display device operative to display the at least one form-based record (Irons: col. 11, lns. 4-15; col. 12, lns. 24-33; col. 28, lns. 60-67; figs. 2 & 13);
- a printer operatively connected to the web browser and input device (Irons: col. 12, lns. 48-59; col. 18, lns. 52-57; figs. 1, 2 and 3 – Although Irons is silent about a ‘connection’ between a printer and the web browser, Irons inherently discloses a printer 310 connected to the computer 200 , which then includes the web browser and also connected to an input device);
- a scanner operatively connected to the database (Irons: col. 7, lns. 52-60; col. 8, lns. 1-15; fig. 1); and

Art Unit: 2161

- a remote storage location driver operative to display a remote storage location as a local output device, the remote storage location driver operatively connected to the web browser and database (Irons: col. 11, lns. 45-56; col. 12, lns. 24-45; fig. 2).

Claim 9:

Regarding Claim 9, Irons discloses all the limitation of Claim 8, *supra*. Additionally, Irons discloses: further comprising:

- an input device operatively connected to the database (Irons: col. 7, lns. 52-62; col. 8, lns. 10-15; col. 10, lns. 40-60; figs. 1 & 2); and
- an input recognition module operatively connected to the input device, the input recognition module operative to identify a file on a storage medium within the input device and copy the file to the database (Irons: col. 12, lns. 3-12; col. 16, lns. 41-58; figs. 2 & 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-6 and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0073085 by O'Day, JR. et al. (hereafter O'Day).

Art Unit: 2161

Claim 2:

Regarding Claim 2, Irons discloses all the limitation of Claim 1, *supra*. Although Irons is silent about “synchronizing” between the database with a remote database, Irons discloses “automatic backup” (Irons: col. 17, lns. 14-19). Thus, Irons does not explicitly disclose: further comprising the operation of synchronizing the database with a remote database.

On the other hand, O’Day discloses: synchronizing the database with a remote database (O’Day: pg. 5, [0053]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine this synchronization of O’Day into the unique identification labeling of Irons to utilize synchronizing two databases. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the O’Day’s teaching of synchronizing central and remote databases in the Iron’s unique identification labeling to enhance updating changes real-time as suggested by O’Day, which discloses “the portion of the central database 64 to which a user has access and the remote database 94 on the user’s remote computer 24 contain the same primary information” (O’Day: pg. 5, [0053]).

Claim 3:

Regarding Claim 3, Irons in view of O’Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 2, *supra*. Additionally, O’Day discloses: wherein the operation of synchronizing the database with a remote database comprises copying the information from the database to the remote database (O’Day: pg. 5, [0053]).

Claim 4:

Regarding Claim 4, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 2, *supra*. Additionally, O'Day discloses: wherein the operation of synchronizing the database with a remote database comprises copying the information from the remote database to the database (O'Day: pg. 5, [0053]).

Claim 5:

Regarding Claim 5, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 3, *supra*. Additionally, Irons discloses: further comprising the operation of selecting a form from the remote database (Irons: col. 18, lns. 40-52).

Claim 6:

Regarding Claim 6, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 5, *supra*. Additionally, O'Day discloses: further comprising the operation of presenting the remote database as a local output device (O'Day: col. 12, lns. 47; col. 23, lns. 30-38).

Claim 10:

Regarding Claim 10, Irons discloses all the limitation of Claim 9, *supra*. Additionally, Irons discloses: further comprising:

- a remote storage location operatively connected to the remote storage location driver (Irons: col. 8, lns. 16-29; col. 9, lns. 19-38; col. 10, lns. 13-31; fig. 1); and
- a remote database resident on the remote storage location (Irons: col. 9, lns. 19-38),

However, Irons does not explicitly discloses: the remote database accepting files from the database.

On the other hand, O'Day discloses: the remote database accepting files from the

database (O'Day: pg. 5, [0053]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine this synchronization of O'Day into the unique identification labeling of Irons to utilize synchronizing two databases. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the O'Day's teaching of synchronizing central and remote databases in the Iron's unique identification labeling to enhance updating changes real-time as suggested by O'Day, which discloses "the portion of the central database 64 to which a user has access and the remote database 94 on the user's remote computer 24 contain the same primary information" (O'Day: pg. 5, [0053]).

Claim 11:

Regarding Claim 11, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 10, *supra*. Additionally, O'Day discloses: wherein the remote database accepts files from the database continuously (O'Day: pg. 7, [0073] – Although O'Day is silent about disclosing a term "continuously", the step 435 performs without user control to upload files to activate either steps 440 or 445).

Claim 12:

Regarding Claim 12, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 10, *supra*. Additionally, O'Day discloses: wherein the remote database accepts files from the database at predetermined times (O'Day: pg. 5, [0053]; pg. 8, [0078]).

Claim 13:

Regarding Claim 13, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 10, *supra*. Additionally, O'Day discloses: wherein the database accepts files from the remote database (O'Day: pg. 5, [0053]).

Claim 14:

Regarding Claim 14, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 10, *supra*. Additionally, Irons discloses: further comprising a unique document identifier generation module operatively connected to the database, the unique document identifier generation module operative to generate a unique document identifier corresponding to the at least one form-based record (Irons: col. 7, lns. 12-17; col. 8, lns. 37-42; col. 19, lns. 8-26 & 33-43; figs. 1, 3 and 7a.)

Claim 15:

Regarding Claim 15, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 14, *supra*. Additionally, Irons discloses: further comprising:

- a unique apparatus identifier (Irons: col. 7, lns. 13-33; figs. 1, 3 & 3a); and
wherein
- the unique document identifier is at least partially based on the unique apparatus identifier (Irons: col. 12, lns. 48-55; fig. 3-3e); and
- the at least one form-based record is indexed in the database by the unique document identifier (Irons: col. 8, lns. 30-49; fig. 1).

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons in view of O'Day, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0260569 by Bell et al. (hereafter Bell).

Claim 7:

Regarding Claim 7, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 6, *supra*. Although Irons is silent about "non-network printer", Irons discloses: wherein the local output device is a local (Irons: col. 12, lns. 55-59 – Irons discloses a "desktop label printer" as a "local" printer).

On the other hand, Bell discloses: non-network printer (Bell: pg. 9, [0073]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine this local printer of Bell into the unique identification labeling of Irons and the synchronization of O'Day to utilize printing through a local printer. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the Bell's teaching of local printer example in the Iron's unique identification labeling and the synchronization of O'Day to be able to print without a network connection as suggested by Bell, which discloses "a printer 30 is a laser printer directly connected to the computer 100" (Bell: pg. 9, [0073]).

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons and in view of O'Day, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,651,218 issued to Adler et al. (hereafter Adler).

Claim 16:

Regarding Claim 16, Irons in view of O'Day discloses all the limitation of Claim 15, *supra*. Additionally, Irons discloses: wherein the unique document identifier (Irons: col. 7, lns. 13-33; figs. 1, 3 & 3a)

However, Irons does not disclose: a DataGlyph.

On the other hand, Adler discloses an example of reading pre-printed one or two-dimensional data codes, which is: a DataGlyph (Adler: col. 3, lns. 41-55).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine this DataGlyph of Adler into the unique identification labeling of Irons to utilize making marks on papers. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the Adler's teaching of DataGlyph example in the Iron's unique identification labeling to enhance securely labeling the document as suggested by Adler, which discloses "identifying the genre to which the document belongs, locating at least one significant data item within the document (based on its genre), and extracting and storing each data item in a database" (Adler: see Abstract; col. 4, lns. 47-54).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica M. Pyo whose telephone number is 571-272-8192. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30 - 3:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Monica M Pyo
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

2/17/06


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BC